

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 LYDIA VASQUEZ-BRENES, et al.,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
11 DEPARTMENT, et al.,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:12-CV-1635 JCM (VCF)

ORDER

13
14 Presently before the court is plaintiffs' unopposed motion requesting that this court provide
15 written indication pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62.1 and Federal Rule of Appellate
16 Procedure 12.1(b) that the court is willing to entertain a motion for relief from judgment pursuant
17 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(a).

18 Plaintiffs seek clarification regarding this court's treatment of their pendant state law
19 claims, arguing that the Ninth Circuit's memorandum in this action did not discuss the state claims.
20 (ECF No. 90). Specifically, they wish the court would articulate if the pendant state law claims
21 were dismissed without prejudice in connection with a decision not to exercise supplemental
22 jurisdiction over those claims. (*Id.*).

23 Plaintiffs also seek clarification whether the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
24 would remain a party to this case due to a vicarious liability theory, though the specific claims
25 against that defendant have been resolved. (*Id.*).

26 ...

27 ...


28 ...

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Accordingly,

The court ISSUES an indicative ruling pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62.1(a)(3) that plaintiff's unopposed motion raises a substantial issue.

DATED May 19, 2017.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE